

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Objections

Examiner has objected to claims 6-9, stating that claims 6 and 8 are the same and that claims 7 and 9 are the same.

Applicant's Response

Applicant respectfully points out that claim 6 claims translucent material, while claim 8 claims transparent material. Translucent material permits the passage of light, but without a clear image being visible therethrough. Transparent material permits the passage of light with minimal scattering, thereby permitting clear images of objects to be seen therethrough. Applicant has appended pages from the New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary of the English Language setting forth the differences between translucent and transparent.

Applicant respectfully points out that claim 7 claims translucent material, while claim 9 claims transparent material. Translucent material permits the passage of light, but without a clear image being visible therethrough. Transparent material permits the passage of light with minimal scattering, thereby permitting clear images of objects to be seen therethrough. Applicant has appended pages from the New Lexicon Webster's Dictionary of the English Language setting forth the differences between translucent and transparent.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant's Response

Applicant has amended claim 18 replacing 'desire' with 'tendency' to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. Applicant has amended claim 32 to provide the antecedent basis for the peripheral edges.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 10, 11, 13-15, 17, and 19-29 as anticipated by Manning (U.S. Pat. No. 3,854,673).

Applicant's Response

Applicant has amended the specification paragraph beginning at page 12, line 13 to clarify the positioning of the spool holder and the bobbin holder, and consequently the spool and bobbin held therein, as non-coaxial. This is readily apparent in Figures 1-8. Claims 1, 26 and 30 have been amended to claim non-coaxial positioning of the spool holder/spool and bobbin holder/bobbin.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner has misconstrued claim 10, stating that the bobbin holder of Manning '673 comprises a 'U'-shape. In claim 10 of Applicant's invention, it is the spool receiving member that comprises a 'U'-shape, as claimed. Nothing in Manning '673 discloses a 'U'-shaped spool receiving member. Furthermore, nothing in Manning '673 discloses Applicant's "at least one generally coil-shaped member".

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-9 as unpatentable over Manning '673 in view of Spencer (U.S. Pat. No. 4,998,685).

The Examiner has rejected claims 12 and 16 as unpatentable over Manning '673 in view of Staufert (U.S. Pat. No. 2,914,271).

The Examiner has rejected claim 18 as unpatentable over Manning '673 in view of Dougherty U.S. Pat. No. 897,822).

The Examiner has rejected claims 30-33 as unpatentable over Manning '673 in view of Fridolph U.S. Pat. No. 3,284,025).

Applicant's Response

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 30 to claim the non-coaxial positioning of the spool holder and the bobbin holder, distinguishing over the prior art, and Applicant respectfully asserts that all Examiner's rejection of claims depending therefrom is now moot.

New Claims

Applicant has amended the specification paragraph beginning at page 8, line 19 to point out that the rear, or bottom, portion of the 'U'-shaped bobbin holder is carried proximate the spool retention section, as is disclosed in Figures 1-8 and in the paragraph beginning at page 8, line 19. Applicant has added new claims 34 and 35 to claim the carriage of the rear, or bottom, portion of the 'U'-shaped bobbin holder proximate the spool retention section.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been added. In view of Applicant's amendment to claims 1, 26 and 30, Examiner's rejection of all claims depending therefrom is now moot.

In light of the above amendments to claims 1, 26 and 30, Applicant respectfully believes that amended claims 1, 26 and 30, and all claims depending therefrom, along with new claims 34 and 35, are now in condition for allowance. If Examiner disagrees with Applicant's position and would like to receive further clarifying explanations of the significance of Applicant's invention, it is respectfully requested that Applicant be granted a telephone interview with Examiner.

Otherwise, should the Examiner have any questions regarding this submission, he is invited to contact the undersigned counsel at the telephone number below.

{Signature follows on next page}

Murphy, Jr., H. Stetser

Appl. No.: 10/776,847

Filed: February 11, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 22270-RA1

Page 16 of 16

Respectfully submitted, this 16th day of May, 2005,



Thomas R. Williamson III, Esq.

Reg. No. 47,180

Email: twilliamson@mkiplaw.com

MYERS & KAPLAN,
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, L.L.C.
1899 Powers Ferry Road
Suite 310
Atlanta, GA 30339
Phone: (770) 541-7444
Fax: (770) 541-7448